

PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins

APPELLANT

PruneYard Shopping Center

APPELLEE

Robins

LOCATIONThe Pruneyard**DOCKET NO.**

79-289

DECIDED BYBurger Court (/courts?court=Burger Court)**LOWER COURT**

Supreme Court of California

CITATION447 US 74 (1980)(<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/447/74>)**ADVOCATES**Elinor Hadley Stillman([advocates/elinor_hadley_stillman](#))*Argued the cause for the United States as amicus curiae urging affirmance***ARGUED**

Mar 18, 1980

Philip L. Hammer ([advocates/philip_l_hammer](#))*Argued the cause for the appellee***DECIDED**

Jun 9, 1980

Max L. Gillam, Jr. ([advocates/max_l_gillam](#))*Argued the cause for the appellants*Elinor Hadley Stillman([advocates/elinor_h_stillman](#))*for United States, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court*

Facts of the case

High school students seeking support for their opposition to a United Nations resolution against Zionism set up a table in PruneYard to distribute literature and solicit signatures for a petition. A security guard told them to leave since their actions violated the shopping center's regulations against "publicly expressive" activities.

Question

Did PruneYard's regulations violate the students' free speech rights?

Conclusion

Sort: [by seniority](#) [by ideology](#) [≤ decision 1 of 2 ≥](#)

UNANIMOUS DECISION

MAJORITY OPINION BY WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

William J. Brennan Jr. Byron R. White Harry A. Blackmun William H. Rehnquist



Warren E. Burger Peter Stewart Thurgood Marshall Lewis F. Powell Jr. John Paul Stevens

UNANIMOUS DECISION

MAJORITY OPINION BY WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

William J. Brennan Jr. Byron R. White Harry A. Blackmun William H. Rehnquist



Warren E. Burger Peter Stewart Thurgood Marshall Lewis F. Powell Jr. John Paul Stevens

Yes. Since the California Constitution protected "speech and petitioning, reasonably exercised, in shopping centers even when the shopping centers are privately owned," PruneYard could not prevent the students from soliciting on its property. The Court argued that it was within California's power to guarantee this expansive free speech right since it did not unreasonably intrude on the rights of private property owners.

Cite this page

[APA](#) [Bluebook](#) [Chicago](#) [MLA](#)

"PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins." Oyez, <https://www.oyez.org/cases/1979/79-289>. Accessed 14 May. 2017.